

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**COURT OF APPEALS**

---

In the Matter of DJH and DKH, Minors.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

DIANE HARTLEY BLANKS,

Respondent-Appellant

and

JAMES R. CAMERON and JARVARIOUS  
JONES,

Respondents.

---

Before: Collins, P.J., and Hoekstra and Gage, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant Diane Hartley Blanks (respondent) appeals as of right from the order terminating her parental rights to the minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(g) and (j); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(g) and (j). We affirm.

In order to terminate parental rights, the circuit court must find that at least one of the statutory grounds for termination has been met by clear and convincing evidence. *In re Jackson*, 199 Mich App 22, 25; 501 NW2d 182 (1993). Once a statutory ground is established, termination of parental rights is mandatory unless the court finds that termination clearly is not in the child's best interest. MCL 712A.19b(5); MSA 27.3178(598.19b); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 354; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). We review the family court's findings of fact for clear error. MCR 5.974(I); *In re Sours*, 459 Mich 624, 633; 593 NW2d 520 (1999).

Clear and convincing evidence supported termination in this case under both statutory subsections. Although the record shows that respondent and her children share a close bond, the

record also shows that respondent continued to have contact with and marry her boyfriend after she knew of his violent tendencies, after she knew that he likely injured her children, and after the court ordered that he have no contact with respondent's children. Although respondent later divorced her husband, trial testimony indicated that she continued to be involved with him. While respondent testified that she was no longer involved with her ex-husband and had no intention of resuming the relationship, the court's findings indicate that it did not credit respondent's testimony. Credibility determinations are for the trier of fact, *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989), and we find nothing in the record to suggest that the trial court clearly erred in this regard.

We conclude, therefore, that the trial court did not err in concluding that respondent failed to provide proper care or custody for her children, that there was no expectation that she would be able to do so within a reasonable time, and that there was a reasonable likelihood the children would be harmed if returned to respondent. MCL 712A.19b(g) and (j); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(g) and (j). Further, the evidence did not establish that termination of respondent's parental rights was clearly not in the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(5); *In re Trejo, supra*.

Affirmed.

/s/ Jeffrey G. Collins

/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra

/s/ Hilda R. Gage